

## Interview Summary

Application No. **09/755,734** 

Applicant(s)

Podsakoff

Examiner

Anne Marie S. Beckerleg

Group Art Unit

1632



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):
(1) Anne Marie S. Beckerleg (3) Christic Thomson
(2) Ken Chanine (4)
Date of Interview Oct 11, 2001
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☑ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☑ applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e)  No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: 23-34
Identification of prior art discussed:
Agreement with respect to the claims f) $\square$ was reached. g) $\bowtie$ was not reached. h) $\square$ N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  II2, find paramorph, descuessed submitting the I32 data home the paramorphism to defect the free applicant defecting the free new method of the free applicant of the arterior of the manufacture of the property of the applicant of the manufacture of the property of the applicant of the property of the property of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, a summary thereof must be attached.)
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached
į,
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.